UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,107	02/13/2001	Mihal Lazaridis	555255012189	3129

7590   10/23/2003

David B. Cochran, Esq.
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER
EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	22

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 August 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29,42 and 43* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29,42 and 43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *18* .   6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicant's declaration and request for

reconsideration filed on August 21, 2003. Claims 1-29, 42, and 43 are presented for

examination.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant has canceled all non-elected claims, so the previous restriction

requirement no longer applies.

Response to Amendment

The Affidavit filed on August 21, 2003 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to

overcome the Wright, Adler, and Moon references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1-10, 13, 16, 22, 24-26, 28, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over AirMobile (AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc:Mail,

Motorola, 1995), in view of Takahashi et al. ("Communication Method with Data

Compression and Encryption for Mobile Computing Environment," ISOC INET

Proceedings, June, 1996, hereinafter "Takahashi").

In considering claim 1, AirMobile discloses an electronic message redirection

system, comprising:

A host system (AirMobile Wireless for cc:Mail Server) having a redirector

application, wherein the redirector application is configured to sense a trigger event

("Enable" message) and in response to the trigger event to continuously redirect

electronic message from the host system to a mobile data communication device (p. 17,

"Enable/Disable" paragraph); and

A wired network coupled to the host system, a wireless data network coupled to

the mobile device, and a wireless gateway ("wireless network adapter") coupled

between the wired network and the wireless data network for transmitting messages

between the wired and wireless networks (p. 9, Fig. 1-1);

Wherein a packaging module at the host system packages the electronic

messages into electronic envelopes prior to redirecting messages over the wireless link

through the wireless gateway, and the mobile device includes a corresponding

unpackaging module for extracting the electronic messages from the electronic

envelopes (this packaging and unpackaging of messages send from an e-mail server to

an e-mail client is inherently included in the system; see pp. 30-31, describing the mail

forwarding system).

However, AirMobile does not disclose including encryption modules and

compression modules at the host system and corresponding decryption and

decompression modules at the mobile device for encrypting and compressing messages, such that messages remain packaged, encrypted and compressed, and thus secure, throughout the message redirection process. Nonetheless, packaging, encrypting and compressing messages sent from a wired to a wireless network in such a manner is well known, as evidenced by Takahashi. In a similar art, Takahashi discloses a communication system for use in mobile computing environments, wherein a host server or client packages, encrypts, and compresses messages to be sent to mobile devices, and wherein the messages are decrypted, unpackaged, and decompressed at the wireless device, thereby utilizing a secure, end-to-end messaging process (see Fig. 1, showing the wired-to-wireless system, with hosts, PCs, and a wireless gateway, and a wireless device; Fig. 7, showing the end-to-end encryption, compression, and packaging method; see also p. 2, ¶ 1, 3; p. 5, ¶ 2; p. 6, ¶ 3, 4).

Given the teaching of Takahashi, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using the packaging, encryption, and compression method taught by Takahashi at the host system in the wired-to-wireless messaging system taught by AirMobile for obvious reasons (i.e. to increase security and save bandwidth on the system, or, as stated by Takahashi, to "easily achieve secure and efficient communication with all existing communication application programs and popular TCP/IP programs," p. 6, Conclusion). Thus, it would have been obvious to use the packaging, encryption, and compression method taught by Takahashi by the host system in redirecting the messages in the system taught by AirMobile.

In considering claims 2-7, claims 2-7 contain no further limitations over claim 1, and merely separate the features disclosed in claim 1 into separate dependent claims. Thus, claims 2-7 are rejected for the same reasons as stated with respect to claim 1.

In considering claim 8, claim 8 contains the further limitations of detecting that a redirection trigger has occurred and generating a redirection trigger, receiving messages directed to a first address at the host system from plurality of message senders, and in response to the trigger, continuously redirecting messages between the host system and the mobile device via the secure link. Except for the secure link aspect, these additional features are further taught by AirMobile. See p. 30, ¶ 5-6; p. 31, ¶ 1-2, describing the continuous redirection system; see also, p. 17, ¶ 4, describing the enable/disable trigger for initiating continuous redirection.

In considering claim 9, AirMobile further discloses receiving messages at the mobile device, transmitting reply messages from the mobile device to the host system and configuring the messages at the host system before sending the messages to message senders (p. 38, point 4), wherein the reply messages use the first address associated with the host system as the originating address (i.e. "Mitch Hansen@99999999"), such that messages generated at either the host system or the mobile device share the first address (i.e. the same cc:Mail program is used to send messages from the wireless device or from the host).

In considering claim 10, AirMobile further teaches storing information regarding the configuration of the mobile data communication device at the host system (p. 29).

In considering claim 13, AirMobile further discloses determining whether the receiver address is associated with the mobile device, if so then determining a network address of the mobile device and repackaging the messages into electronic envelopes addressed using the receiver address and the network address of the mobile device, and after receiving the messages at the mobile device, extracting the messages from the envelopes and displaying the messages using the sender and recipient addresses so it appears that the mobile device is the host system (p. 17, 39).

In considering claim 16, AirMobile further discloses that the redirection events include external, internal, or networked events (p. 17, ¶ 4, enable/disable trigger).

In considering claim 22, AirMobile further discloses that the mobile device is a wirelessly enabled laptop (Fig. 1-1).

In considering claims 24-26, and 28, AirMobile further discloses the preferred list activated and deactivated at the host, wherein senders can be added and subtracted to the list by configuring the host system (p. 42, describing setting filters at the host according to sender).

In considering claim 42, claim 42 presents no further limitations over claims 9

and 13, and is thus rejected for the same reasons as stated regarding claims 9 and 13.

2.   Claims 11, 12, 17, 27, 29, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over AirMobile and Takahashi, in view of MobileVision (Mobile Vision User

Manual, CE Software, 1995).

In considering claim 11, AirMobile further discloses that the configuration

information stored at the host system includes the network address of the mobile device

(p. 29), and further discloses rules regarding which attachments should be received and

processed at the mobile device (p. 45). However AirMobile does not disclose

determining the types of messages that the mobile device can receive (i.e. is capable of

receiving). Nonetheless, determining which attachments a mobile device is capable of

receiving is well known in the art, as evidenced by MobileVision.

In a similar art, MobileVision discloses an e-mail forwarding system for

forwarding messages from a host to a mobile device, including separating an

attachment from a message, and redirecting the message from the host system to the

mobile device and further discloses that attachments that the mobile device cannot

receive (according to the enclosure rules may be removed from the e-mail prior to the e-

mail being forwarded to the mobile device (p. 4-25; 4-32)). Thus, it would have been

obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use such an attachment

processing scheme in the system taught by AirMobile so that extremely large

attachments, or attachments of a particular type that can't be processed by the mobile

device taught by AirMobile, do not waste network bandwidth by being sent to a device

that cannot process them.

In considering claim 12, AirMobile further discloses that the host stores an

indication of the type of mobile device (p. 21, wherein the ID format indicates the type of

receiving modem).

In considering claim 17, MobileVision further discloses that the trigger for sending

messages to the mobile device can comprise a message sent from the wireless device

(see pp. 4-21 – 4-23). It would have been obvious to include this in the system taught

by AirMobile so that users can trigger forwarding from anywhere, instead of from only a

limited number of places.

In considering claims 27 and 29, MobileVision further discloses that the user can

add or subtract senders on a filter list by sending a message from the wireless device

(see p. 4-26).

In considering claim 43, AirMobile further teaches that the system could run via a

paging protocol (i.e. CDPD, p. 8). In addition, MobileVision further discloses that the

device could be an e-mail enabled paging PDA (p. 1-1). Thus, a person having ordinary

skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using

the e-mail forwarding system taught by AirMobile and Takahashi and MobileVision on

pagers, instead of laptops or even pdas, because pagers are smaller than either of

those and are thus easier to carry. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the

messaging system taught by AirMobile, Takahashi, and MobileVision for a pager.

3.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

AirMobile and Takahashi, in view of MobileVision, and further in view of Theimer et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692, hereinafter "Theimer")

In considering claim 14, again, AirMobile additionally discloses determining

whether messages include attachments, and removing attachments and processing the

messages according to user-selected criteria (p. 45). Again, as discussed with regard

to claim 11, MobileVision discloses determining the types of messages that the mobile

device should receive (p. 4-25; 4-32) and sending them to the mobile device. However,

neither AirMobile nor MobileVision disclose redirecting the attachments to a device

capable of processing the attachments, if it is determined that the mobile device cannot

process them. Nonetheless, this step is well known, as evidenced by Theimer.

In a similar art, Theimer discloses a system for selectively delivering electronic

messages to one or more users who are using a mobile communication device (col. 24,

lines 49-55), wherein the messages will be redirected from a host (server) to an

appropriate display device according to device characteristics, the context, and the

message characteristics (col. 25, lines 17-38). Thus, given the teaching of Theimer, a

person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and

advantages of forwarding the attachments removed by the host in the system taught by

AirMobile and MobileVision to an appropriate display device, as taught by Theimer, so

that a user at a remote location can view the attachment immediately (see Theimer, col.

25, lines 23-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to forward the attachments

taught by AirMobile and MobileVision to a user via the display device system taught by

Theimer.

4.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

AirMobile, Takahashi, MobileVision, and Theimer, further in view of Cooper et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 6,052,442, hereinafter "Cooper").

In considering claim 15, Cooper further discloses that attachments to messages

may be sound files, and that such attachments can be processed by an appropriate

device (i.e. audio attachments may be played on a answering machine speaker, see

col. 3, lines 25-28). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the

art to include audio attachments to the messages in the combined system taught by

AirMobile, MobileVision, and Theimer, so that users can obtain important voice

messages when on the road.

5.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

AirMobile and Takahashi, in view of Dunker (CE Software Announces MobileVision, CE

Software, Inc., 1995, hereinafter "Dunker").

In considering claim 21, although the system taught by AirMobile and Takahashi discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose the networked events including messages to begin redirection from computer systems other than the mobile data communication device, which are connected to the host system via a wired network. In a similar art, Dunker discloses a system for forwarding messages from a host system to a mobile device, wherein a plurality of desktop systems are in communication with the host, and the operation of the forwarding program can be configured using one of the plurality of desktop systems (p. 1, paragraph 5, "rules can be modified at either the office or from the road"). Therefore, given the teaching of Dunker, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of allowing users at networked stations to control redirection of the system in case a user loses his/her mobile device and still wants to receive the messages. Therefore, it would have been obvious to control the forwarding of messages in the system taught by AirMobile and Takahashi via a networked computer, as taught by Dunker.

6.   Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, in view of Takahashi, and further in view of Owens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,700, hereinafter "Owens").

In considering claim 23, although the system taught by AirMobile and Takahashi discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the mobile device can process voice and non-voice data messages. Nonetheless, receiving voice

attachments to e-mail is well known, as evidenced by Owens. In a similar art, Owens

teaches a system for forwarding electronic mail messages from a host to a recipient,

wherein the messages can include voice attachments (col. 3, lines 49-64; Abstract).

Thus, given the teaching of Owens, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have

readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including voice attachments as

one of the attachments taught by AirMobile in the combined system of AirMobile and

Takahashi, so that blind users can easily receive messages. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to allow the laptop taught by AirMobile to receive both voice and non-

voice attachments.

7.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuki (EP

Patent No. 772,327 A2), in view of Takahashi.

        In considering claim 19, Kuki discloses a method of exchanging messages

between a host system and a wireless mobile data communication device via a wireless

communication network (col. 4, lines 10-20), including configuring one or more

redirection events at the host system (col. 4, lines 50-54), detecting that a redirection

event has occurred at the host and generating a redirection trigger, and in response to

the trigger, exchanging messages between the host system and the mobile device by

continuously redirecting the messages received at the host system to the mobile device

(col. 5, lines 37-43; col. 6, lines 22-30). Kuki further discloses that the redirection event

is a calendar alarm. Although Kuki does not explicitly disclose a wireless gateway for

connecting the wired and wireless network, such a gateway is inherent and would be

necessary to complete the wired-to-wireless communication.

In addition, although Kuki does not disclose the use of a secure link between the

host system and the wireless device, such a link is well known, as taught by Takahashi,

and would have been obvious to include in the system taught by Kuki to improve the

network bandwidth usage and security of the system (as discussed previously in this

action).

8.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuki, in

view of Takahashi, and further in view of Kumomura (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,219).

In considering claim 19, Kuki discloses a method of exchanging messages

between a host system and a wireless mobile data communication device via a wireless

communication network (col. 4, lines 10-20), including configuring one or more

redirection events at the host system (col. 4, lines 50-54), detecting that a redirection

event has occurred at the host and generating a redirection trigger, and in response to

the trigger, exchanging messages between the host system and the mobile device by

continuously redirecting the messages received at the host system to the mobile device

(col. 5, lines 37-43; col. 6, lines 22-30). Kuki further discloses that the redirection event

is an internal event (i.e. calendar alarm). Although Kuki does not explicitly disclose a

wireless gateway for connecting the wired and wireless network, such a gateway is

inherent and would be necessary to complete the wired-to-wireless communication.

In addition, although Kuki does not disclose the use of a secure link between the host system and the wireless device, such a link is well known, as taught by Takahashi, and would have been obvious to include in the system taught by Kuki to improve the network bandwidth usage and security of the system (as discussed previously in this action).

Finally, although the system taught by Kuki teaches an internal event for triggering redirection of messages, it does not disclose that the event is a screen saver activation. Nonetheless, the use of a screen saver activation to trigger redirection of electronic messages is well known in the art, as evidenced by Kumomura. In a similar art, Kumomura discloses a system for receiving electronic mail at a client machine, wherein received messages are redirected to another networked device if a screen saver is activated (col. 4, lines 58-61, 64-65). Thus, given the teaching of Kumomura, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using a screen saver activation as a redirection event in the system taught by Kuki and Takahashi, so that a user who is most likely away from her host computer can still receive incoming messages at her mobile device (see Kumomura, col. 4, lines 61-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the screen saver activation feature taught by Kumomura in the message redirection system taught by Kuki and Takahashi.

9.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuki, in

view of Takahashi and Kumomura, and further in view of Rakavy et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,913,040, hereinafter "Rakavy").

In considering claim 20 although the combined teaching of Kuki, Takahashi, and

Kumomura does not explicitly discuss a keyboard timeout signal, the use keyboard

timeout signals to trigger screen saver activation is well known, as evidenced by

Rakavy. In a similar art, Rakavy discloses a system for triggering a network

communication between a home computer and a remote computer, wherein a keyboard

timeout will activate a screen saver and thus trigger the network communication (col. 7,

line 63 - col. 8, line 3). Given the teaching of Rakavy, it would have been obvious to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to use a keyboard timeout to activate a screen

saver, thereby activating redirection of the messages disclosed in the system taught by

Kuki, Takahashi, and Kumomura, because (1) the use of keyboard timeout signals to

trigger a screen saver activation is notoriously well known in the art, and (2) a keyboard

timeout is likely to signify that a user is no longer near her computer. Thus, a user

would want messages redirected to her mobile device is she is not near her computer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for an internal event in the system taught by

Kuki, Takahashi, and Kumomura to include a keyboard timeout signal, as taught by

Rakavy.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

For all After Final papers: (703) 746-7238.

For all other correspondences: (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner

BE
October 15, 2003